

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

M.G., by and through his Guardian ad
litem, LaShan Goodwin

No. C 11-04853 WHA

Plaintiff,

**ORDER SETTING SCHEDULE
AND REQUESTING BRIEFING**

v.

COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA, et al.,

Defendants.

Without reaching the question of the inadequacy of the declaration concerning the blanket unavailability of the other county attorneys, the Court will accommodate Attorney Janice Amenta and hold a hearing on the summary judgment motion and the motion to amend on **FEBRUARY 25 AT 3:00 P.M.** in Courtroom 8, on the 19th Floor, United States Courthouse, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102. Defendants' request to continue the trial date may also be heard at that hearing.


Plaintiff does not oppose defendants' motion for summary judgment. Instead, plaintiff has filed a motion for leave to amend its complaint. Plaintiff's counsel, however, has briefed the wrong standard. The time to amend under the case management order has long since passed. Any possibility of amendment is now governed by Rule 16(b), not by Rule 15. Accordingly, plaintiff's counsel shall file a supplemental brief in support of its request for leave to amend by **FEBRUARY 19 AT NOON**. Defendants' opposition will be due by **FEBRUARY 21 AT NOON**. As

1 noted above, the matter will be heard with the summary judgment motion on February 25. No
2 replies, please.

3 Plaintiff is requested to comply with the requirements of Local Rule 3-4 in all future
4 filings.

5
6 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

7
8 Dated: February 15, 2013.



WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE